The Expressions of Structure

Dominance and the Forms Local Structuration Takes

Vladisav Jovanović

2026

Abstract

If structure is the patterned stabilization of relation within an already differentiated field, then the next question is unavoidable: does structure take different forms, and if so, what determines which form becomes dominant?

This paper argues that structure does not appear in only one expression. Local structurations hold, adapt, persist, weaken, and fail in multiple ways depending on how relation, load, repair, time, defense, and cost are organized. Some expressions are more integrated. Some preserve continuity through rigidity. Some rely on patching and compensation. Some produce the appearance of holding without carrying equivalent load. Some survive by exporting burden outward or by feeding on stronger surrounding formations.

To sharpen this, the paper introduces two visibility devices. First, Structural Debt (D_s): the accumulation of patches, deferred repair, hidden burden, workaround logic, and unowned error used to preserve continuity without real reorganization. Second, a Dominance Ratio (E_d): the experienced ratio between stability and metabolic cost that helps explain why one expression governs a field even when healthier forms are theoretically possible.

The aim of the paper is not to create a decorative taxonomy. It is to make structural diagnosis more exact. In most real situations, multiple structural tendencies coexist. The decisive question is not whether structure is present, but which expression is dominant, what it is organized around, what costs it hides, and how it behaves under pressure.

Across personal life, relationships, institutions, and technological systems, the same lesson appears: structure is not one flat category. It is a field of possible expressions. What matters is which expression governs the local field and what makes it govern.

The paper concludes by repositioning Structural Intelligence accordingly. It is not enough to detect that a structure exists. One must learn to distinguish what expression of local structuration is present, why it dominates, and whether the system can move from a lower or more defended form toward a more load-bearing one.

Keywords: structure; structural intelligence; dominance; local structuration; structural debt; repair; coherence; institutions; technology; integration; compensation; decay; emergence

1. Introduction: If Structure Exists, It Must Take Different Forms

Once structure is understood as the patterned stabilization of relation within an already differentiated field, the concept immediately becomes more demanding. It is no longer enough to say that there is a structure present. One must also ask what kind of structuration is present and how it is holding.

This question matters because in actual life local structurations do not appear in only one expression. A relationship has structure, but not every relationship is structured in the same way. An institution has structure, but not every institution organizes load, truth, legitimacy, and repair in the same form. A psyche has structure, but not every psyche holds itself through the same relational logic. The same is true of technologies, social systems, and forms of selfhood.

So the real question is no longer:

> *Is there structure here?*

It becomes:

> *What expression of local structuration is present here, which one is dominant, and why this one rather than another?*

This shift matters because most situations are mixed. Multiple structural tendencies coexist. Something may be partly integrated, partly compensatory, partly decaying, partly performative. The task is not to force purity where reality is mixed. The task is to identify which expression is organizing the rest.

This paper therefore treats structure not as one flat category but as a field of possible expressions. What follows is a practical typology and a set of principles for understanding dominance.

2. From Structure to Expressions of Structure

The previous paper clarified the broader ontology. The field is already differentiated. Structure is the patterned stabilization of relation across that field. Local structuration is the localized stabilization that emerges, persists, dominates, weakens, or fails in a particular domain or at a relevant scale.

That clarification now needs a sequel.

It is one thing to say that local structurations exist. It is another to say how they hold. The same broad field can contain formations that are integrated, rigid, compensatory, performative, adaptive, decaying, extractive, or parasitic. These are not merely styles. They are different relational logics by which a local structuration continues.

An expression of structure therefore means the dominant way a local structuration holds, adapts, persists, or fails under its actual conditions. What is at stake is not surface appearance alone, but the governing logic of continuity.

The most important idea can be stated simply:

> *Local structurations do not only exist. They express themselves differently depending on how load, repair, cost, time, and defensive organization are arranged.*

This is what makes diagnosis more precise. A system may be held together, but the deeper question is how.

3. The Problem of Dominance

If local structurations can take multiple expressions, then the next issue is dominance.

Dominance does not mean exclusivity. A system rarely contains only one structural tendency. A university may have pockets of real truth-tracking work inside a broader compliance structure. A relationship may contain real intimacy inside a wider compensatory pattern. A psyche may contain both genuine repair and rigid defense.

The question is therefore not whether other expressions are absent. The question is:

> *Which expression organizes the whole, and which expressions are subordinated to it?*

This matters because the dominant expression sets the terms of survival inside the local field. It determines:

- what gets rewarded,
- what gets filtered,
- what kind of failure becomes normal,
- what kind of truth becomes affordable,
- what kind of repair is possible,
- and what kind of person or process the system tends to produce.

A simple shorthand helps make this visible:

$$E_d = \frac{Stability}{MetabolicCost}$$

Here E_d names the dominant expression as the one the system experiences as the most affordable stability-to-cost ratio under current conditions.

This is not a literal measurement formula. It is a visibility device. It helps explain why lower structural expressions often dominate even when healthier forms are theoretically possible. A performative structure may dominate when the cost of looking right is lower than the cost of being right. A rigid structure may dominate when the cost of adaptation feels greater than the cost of brittleness. A compensatory structure may dominate when patching is cheaper, in the short run, than real repair.

Dominance is therefore a structural fact, not only a descriptive preference. To identify dominance is to identify what is actually governing the field.

4. Structural Debt

Some local structurations continue functioning only by accumulating unresolved burden. To name that more clearly, the paper introduces a second shorthand:

A second shorthand helps make this visible:

$$D_s$$

Here D_s names accumulated unresolved structural burden.

Structural Debt (D_s) refers to the build-up of patches, clutter, workaround logic, deferred repair, hidden cost, and unowned error that a system uses to preserve continuity without performing real structural reorganization.

This concept matters because many systems do not fail immediately when they stop being integrated. They remain operational for a time by taking on debt.

A compensatory structure can therefore still function while carrying high D_s. It works, but expensively. It preserves continuity through patching rather than reorganization. A decaying structure represents a later stage: D_s has risen high enough that repair capacity itself begins to thin. At that point, the system is no longer just burdened. Its ability to recover is being eaten by the very debt it accumulated in order to continue.

This distinction helps explain why some structures remain operational long after they stop being healthy. They are not intact. They are financed by debt.

5. A Typology of Structural Expressions

What follows is not meant as a closed final list. It is a working typology.

Integrated Structure

An integrated structure holds through alignment between flow and load. It does not need constant performance or excessive patching to remain coherent. Its parts are related in a way that allows movement, correction, and adaptation without loss of governing continuity.

Integrated structure tends to show:

- lower maintenance cost,
- better repair capacity,
- lower need for defensive surface control,
- stronger coupling between function and form.

Rigid Structure

A rigid structure holds by resisting change. It achieves continuity through stiffness rather than through living integration. It may be highly stable for a time, but it tends to struggle with adaptation, ambiguity, and contradiction.

Rigid structures often appear strong, but under sufficient pressure they can become brittle.

Compensatory Structure

A compensatory structure holds through patching, clutter, overproduction, burden-shifting, or secondary supports that make up for weak integration. It may function, sometimes for a long time, but the system stays expensive to maintain.

Compensatory structures often look overloaded because they are. They are frequently solvent in the short term, but carry high D_s.

Performative Structure

A performative structure produces the appearance of order without carrying equivalent load. It relies on symbolic finish, legitimacy display, policy language, metrics, image management, or rhetorical completion to substitute for real structural holding.

Its coherence is often persuasive until stronger reality-contact arrives.

Adaptive Structure

An adaptive structure remains itself by reorganizing its relations under pressure. It neither collapses at the first contradiction nor resists change at all cost. It changes in order to continue holding.

Adaptive structures often signal before they break and can metabolize correction without identity panic.

Decaying Structure

A decaying structure still holds, but does so with rising maintenance, weakening contact, growing noise, and thinning repair capacity. The cost of continuation rises, but the system has not yet fully collapsed.

Decaying structures often become more performative as their real load-bearing capacity declines. They also tend to carry very high D_s, often high enough that debt itself begins to block repair.

Extractive Structure

An extractive structure preserves itself by exporting costs outward. It continues functioning by making others, or later stages of the system, pay the burden it refuses to carry internally.

This is common in institutions, relationships, and technologies that appear efficient only because the repair bill is displaced.

Parasitic Structure

A parasitic structure depends on the vitality of another structure while carrying little of its own load. It attaches itself to a stronger system and lives off its coherence, energy, legitimacy, or resources.

Its persistence depends on the continued availability of a host.

6. How Dominance Is Produced

What makes one structural expression dominant rather than another?

Several factors matter.

Constraint Environment

Different pressures favor different expressions. Under severe threat, rigid or compensatory structures may become dominant because survival is prioritized over elegance. Under lower noise and better conditions, adaptive or integrated structures may emerge more easily.

History

Structures inherit their past. Repetition creates grooves. What has repeatedly stabilized a system in the past often gains dominance even when it becomes costly later.

Incentives

Whatever the system rewards will tend to consolidate. If performance is rewarded over truth, performative structure grows. If speed is rewarded over repair, extractive and compensatory expressions gain ground.

Defense

Some structures dominate because they regulate pain. A system may preserve a lower structural form because a higher form would require more contact, grief, ambiguity, or revision than it can currently bear.

Repair Capacity

The ability to revise without collapse strongly affects structural dominance. Systems with low repair capacity often fall back on rigid, performative, or compensatory expressions because these protect continuity when reorganization feels unsafe.

These factors do not act separately. Dominance usually emerges through their interaction.

7. The Diagnostic Question: How Does This Structure Hold?

A useful structural question follows:

> *How does this structure hold?*

This question matters more than surface appearance.

A system may hold through integration. It may hold through fear. It may hold through overwork. It may hold through symbolic legitimacy. It may hold through cost export. It may hold through repetition after the original purpose has died.

The question "how does it hold?" makes visible the dominant expression.

To answer it well, one must ask:

- What is carrying the load?
- What is compensating?
- What is being hidden?
- What happens when pressure rises?
- Where does the cost go?
- Can the structure repair, or only defend?

This is where the expressions of structure become more than a typology. They become a practical method of diagnosis.

8. A Failure Logic of Structural Expressions

Different expressions fail differently.

Integrated and adaptive structures usually show strain, signal, and reorganize before collapse. Their failure process is often informative because it reveals the actual limits of the arrangement.

Rigid structures tend to fracture suddenly once pressure exceeds what resistance can absorb.

Compensatory structures often fail through overload. They become too cluttered, too expensive, too patched, too dependent on secondary supports.

Performative structures fail through exposure. Their collapse often looks sudden because their holding was symbolic more than load-bearing.

Extractive structures fail when the cost they export returns, or when the host field they consume is depleted.

Parasitic structures fail when the host weakens or withdraws.

A useful visual contrast can clarify the deepest difference here.

Vapor structures — especially performative and rigid ones — are like glass. They may hold cleanly and appear complete right up to the limit. But because they do not have real internal load paths that can register and absorb strain, they tend to shatter when the limit is crossed. The result is disorientation: the system had surface integrity, but not load-bearing continuity.

Real structure — especially integrated and adaptive forms — is closer to a load-bearing spine. It creaks, yields, signals, and sometimes partially degrades, but these are not merely weaknesses. They are information. They reveal strain early enough for a repair loop or reorganization to become possible.

This is why failure is not only an ending. It is also a disclosure. It reveals what kind of expression had been dominant all along.

9. Expressions of Structure in Personal Life

The typology becomes clearer in personal life.

A person can hold themselves through integrated structure: reflective capacity, repair, emotional tolerance, and the ability to revise without collapse.

A different person may hold themselves rigidly: fixed identity claims, defensive certainty, resistance to contradiction, and low ambiguity tolerance.

Another may hold themselves compensatorily: cluttered routines, overwork, emotional patching, self-soothing substitutions, and escalating burden.

A person can also become performative: coherent self-description replaces real integration; insight becomes display; identity becomes a finished story that protects against contact.

Relationships show similar variation. Some are adaptive and metabolize friction into repair. Others are rigid and survive only by narrowing what can be said. Others are compensatory, held together by anxiety regulation, fear of loss, role performance, or mutually distributed unfinished pain.

The point is not to moralize these forms. It is to identify what expression dominates and what it costs.

10. Expressions of Structure in Institutions

Institutions also reveal their dominant structural expression under pressure.

A truth-tracking institution is closer to adaptive or integrated structure. It can incorporate contradiction, preserve some contact with reality, and revise without complete identity failure.

A compliance institution is often rigid or performative. It preserves order through form, policy, and metric stability, even when these drift away from the domain's real purpose.

A decaying institution often becomes more symbolic as it weakens. It speaks more about excellence, integrity, innovation, or care while losing the actual conditions that make those things possible.

An extractive institution may continue appearing efficient because it exports burden onto workers, students, patients, precarious staff, or future budgets.

These are not abstract possibilities. They are common. This is why institutional diagnosis must go beyond official purpose and ask what expression of structure is actually dominant.

11. Expressions of Structure in Technology

Technology does not stand outside these expressions. It amplifies them.

An AI system inserted into an integrated structure may improve traceability, contradiction detection, and revision support.

The same AI inserted into a performative structure may generate legitimacy theater, fluent completion, and institutional unreality at higher speed.

A platform built around adaptive and answerable design would try to keep users more authorial and more reality-coupled.

A platform organized around capture will optimize for dependence, completion, and behavioral steering.

Technology therefore does not remove the question of structural expression. It sharpens it.

The crucial question becomes:

> *What expression of structure is this technology amplifying?*

That question matters more than the advertised functionality of the tool.

12. A Comparative Matrix

A compact matrix may help summarize the typology.

Expression	**How it Holds**	**Typical Cost / Failure**
Integrated	alignment of relation and load	informative strain, lower maintenance
Rigid	resistance to change	brittleness, fracture, reduced adaptability
Compensatory	patching, clutter, substitution	overload, exhaustion, high maintenance / rising D_s
Performative	symbolic finish, surface legitimacy	exposure, sudden collapse, hidden unreality
Adaptive	reorganization under pressure	partial failure with repair, revision burden
Decaying	continuation through weakening supports	slow erosion, then break; rising noise, cost, and D_s
Extractive	cost export to others or later	return of deferred burden, externalized damage
Parasitic	dependence on host structure	host depletion or detachment, low self-carrying capacity

This matrix is not the theory. It is a handle. Its purpose is to make the question of structural dominance easier to ask in practice.

13. Can Structures Shift Expression?

Yes, but not freely.

A structure can move from compensatory to integrated form. A rigid structure can become more adaptive. A decaying structure can either repair or harden into performance. A performative structure can sometimes be forced back into contact by failure.

But shifts are costly. They usually require:

- stronger contact with constraint,
- enough repair capacity,
- tolerable ambiguity,
- some reduction in defensive dependence,
- and a willingness to lose the old way of holding.

That last point matters. Lower expressions of structure often persist because they still regulate something the system is afraid to lose. A more integrated expression may be possible in principle but blocked in practice because the transition cost is too high for the current form to bear.

This is why structural development is not merely conceptual. It is existential, institutional, and temporal.

14. What This Changes for Structural Intelligence

If this paper is right, then Structural Intelligence must become more exact.

It is not enough to say:

> *There is a structure here.*

The more serious question is:

> *What kind of local structuration is this, which expression dominates, what makes it dominant, and what would be required for it to shift?*

That changes the task of SI.

Structural Intelligence becomes less like general pattern-recognition and more like expression diagnosis. It must learn to distinguish:

- integration from compensation,
- adaptation from performance,
- load-bearing continuity from symbolic stability,
- repair from patching,
- real holding from defended appearance.

That is a deeper and more practical intelligence. It sees not only that there is order, but what kind of order is governing the local field.

15. Conclusion: Structure as a Field of Possible Expressions

This paper began with a simple question: if structure is real, does it appear in different forms?

The answer proposed here is yes. Structure is not one flat category. It is a field of possible expressions. Different local structurations hold in different ways, fail in different ways, and govern life through different relational logics.

That is why diagnosis must become more exact. The question is not only whether a structure exists, but which expression is dominant, what it is organized around, what it costs, and whether it can shift.

The formal additions sharpen this picture. D_s names the unresolved burden by which structures continue beyond their real integration. E_d names the experienced stability-to-cost ratio that helps explain why lower structural forms can dominate for long periods even when better forms are possible. The failure contrast between glass and spine clarifies why vapor coherence shatters while load-bearing structure signals strain and reorganizes.

The practical value of this move is large. It allows more precise reading of persons, relationships, institutions, technologies, and systems under pressure. It also clarifies why some structures remain expensive, brittle, unreal, or extractive while others become more integrated and adaptive.

Structural Intelligence therefore has to deepen. It must become the capacity not only to perceive structure, but to identify its dominant expression and the conditions that sustain it.

If the previous step asked what structure is, this step asks how local structuration appears in the world. That is the question of its expressions.

References / Philosophical Context

- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Plato. *Republic*.
- Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Simondon, Gilbert. *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- Jovanović, Vladisav. *Beyond Structural Intelligence: Toward a Philosophy of Structure*. Preprint, 2026.
- Jovanović, Vladisav. *Structural Intelligence and the AI Era: Why Coherence Is Not Truth and Why Intelligibility Must Become Answerable*. Preprint, 2026.
- Jovanović, Vladisav. *The Great Standardization Genealogy of the Grid: Metrics, Platforms, and the Thinning of Answerability*. Preprint, 2026.
- Jovanović, Vladisav. *Truth as Load: Why Human Truth Requires Structure*. Preprint, 2026.

Contact / Licensing Inquiries: SI Hub

Copyright © 2026 Vladisav Jovanović. This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).